



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant had amended the claims a second time after my non-final rejection, thus I called the applicant to discuss why another amendment to only certain claims was filed in an effort to further prosecution. I did not recall that I had spoken with Mr. Grant in December, 2005, thus I specifically asked Mr. Grant a second time if I had called him. Mr. Grant indicated that I did not initiate the call to him in December, 2005 and he indicated that he included the interview summary as required by MPEP 713.04 and since he was amending the claims again. I believe Mr. Grant called me in in this case to discuss the claims generally. I believe I provided my views of the claims and provided no further documentation since nothing of substance resulted from the interview in the case's prosecution, and I did not expect a subsequent amendment would follow. In our 8/10 discussion, the substance of the amendments discussed were made in the 8/28 filed amendment which I believe were made since I believed they would further prosecution. On 8/28 I indicated my previous indication of allowable subject matter has been withdrawn, and I asked them to file a supplemental amendment including the changes in the proposed examiner's amendment.